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I. Overview of the 2020 Schools Update
What is the Subdivision Staging Policy?

• The County’s Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) became law in 1973:
  • “The [Planning] Board may only approve a preliminary plan when it finds that public facilities will be adequate to support and service the subdivision. Public facilities and services to be examined for adequacy include roads and transportation facilities, sewer and water service, schools, police stations, firehouses, and health clinics.” §50.4.3(J) of the County Code

• The SSP is the set of policy tools that administer the APFO, define infrastructure adequacy, and describe how adequacy is measured.
What Does the SSP Do?

- Requires the Planning Board to annually approve the results of a **school test** evaluating projected school capacity *five years in the future*.
- Establishes the criteria for enacting **development moratoria** based on projected school capacity utilization.
- Identifies **exceptions to the moratoria**.
- Previously, established thresholds for **school facility payments**.
Updates to the Subdivision Staging Policy

• Policy is currently updated every four years
• Certain aspects of the policy are updated more frequently:
  • Student generation rates are updated biennially
  • School test results are updated annually
• 2016-2020 Subdivision Staging Policy
  • Adopted by Council Resolution 18-671 on November 15, 2016
  • Council Resolution 18-1087 on April 17, 2018
  • Council Resolution 19-147 on June 25, 2019
2020 Schools Update Effort

• How do we shift the focus of the SSP to be:
  • less about stopping development in areas with inadequate school infrastructure, and
  • more about providing the school infrastructure required to support the type and amount of growth we need, where it’s desired?

• How can the SSP support the county’s other policy priorities?
  • Meeting the county’s housing goals
  • Affordable housing
  • Economic development
  • Improving equity conditions
2020 Schools Update Effort

- **Data-driven and stakeholder-informed**
- Review of all aspects of the policy:
  - The moratorium, its thresholds and its exceptions
  - The Annual School Test procedures
  - Estimating enrollment impacts
  - Development queue and pipeline impacts
  - Impacts of neighborhood turnover on enrollment
  - Potential reintroduction of school facility payments
II. Communications, Outreach and Engagement
Key Accomplishments

• Created (and frequently updated) SSP Update website
• Held kick-off workshop
• Conducted several SSP outreach/presentations
• Conducted five roundtable discussion events
• Delivered several eLetter updates
• Established the STAT and engaged the group in 6 meetings
2020 SSP Update Website

• Updated frequently
• Contains pages for both the STAT and the TISTWG, with materials and videos from meetings
• Contact forms and open-ended questionnaires
Kick-off Workshop

• Held October 7 at the Silver Spring Civic Building
• Attended by approximately 65 people (residents and staff)
• Gathered ideas and concerns related to both schools and transportation
SSP Outreach and Presentations

- Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce Land Use Committee (September 10)
- MCCPTA Fall Training (September 14)
- SSP Kick-off Workshop (October 7)
- Capitol View Park HOA Meeting (November 21)
- Bethesda Downtown Plan Implementation Advisory Committee (December 6)
- Montgomery County Civic Federation Meeting (December 9)
- Friends of White Flint (February 4)
- Darnestown Civic Association (March 19)
- Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation (TBD)
- CASA de Maryland (TBD)
- Citizen Advisory Boards (TBD)
SSP Roundtables

- Developer Roundtable (January 24)
- MCCPTA Roundtable (February 8)
- Upcounty Roundtable (February 20)
- East County Roundtable (February 24)
- Planning Staff Roundtable (March 4)
eLetter Updates

- Updates sent to our Constant Contact SSP group on:
  - August 30
  - December 2
  - January 17
  - February 3
Schools Technical Advisory Team

- The Schools Technical Advisory Team (STAT) has provided analytical guidance to staff and served as a venue for soliciting and vetting policy considerations.

- The STAT consists of a diverse set of stakeholder perspectives and includes representatives from the following:
  - CASA
  - City of Gaithersburg
  - City of Rockville
  - City of Takoma Park
  - Coalition for Smarter Growth
  - Housing Opportunities Commission
  - Montgomery County Chapter of MBIA
  - Montgomery County Civic Federation
  - Montgomery County Council of PTAs
  - Montgomery County EDC
  - Montgomery County Public Schools
  - NAIOP DC|MD

- The STAT also included 12 additional community members

- 11 Commission staff members also participated in the STAT meetings
## Schools Technical Advisory Team

### October 22
- SSP and Impact Tax Overview
- Similar Jurisdictions
- Montgomery County Growth Trends

### November 12
- Alternative Student Generation Rates, Part 1

### December 3
- Alternative Student Generation Rates, Part 2
- Initial Policy Discussion

### January 16
- Moratorium Policy

### January 28
- Funding Mechanisms

### February 18
- Annual School Test
- Development Queue
III. School Adequacy Measures in Other Jurisdictions
## Jurisdictions Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County, MD</td>
<td>Baltimore County, MD</td>
<td>Howard County, MD</td>
<td>Harford County, MD</td>
<td>Loudoun County, VA</td>
<td>Fairfax County, VA</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County, CA</td>
<td>Wake County, NC</td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Snohomish County, WA</td>
<td>Contra Costa County, CA</td>
<td>Pierce County, WA</td>
<td>Montgomery County, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2020 Subdivision Staging Policy Update – Schools Element
Topics Reviewed

• APFO or concurrency thresholds
• Growth management policies
• Moratoria
• Impact fees/taxes
• School construction costs
• School adequacy testing
• Strategies to alleviate school crowding
General Takeaways

• Many jurisdictions and school districts around the country are dealing with similar issues of overcrowding in schools and are frequently evaluating their growth management policies.

• Moratoria on development, while more commonly used for transportation issues, are generally not considered in most jurisdictions outside Maryland as a solution to manage crowding in schools.

• Impact fees are a highly debated option to fund public facilities such as schools and roads.
  • Montgomery County and Howard County charge the highest impact taxes in Maryland.
  • Incentivizing desired development patterns by decreasing/increasing impact fees is becoming more popular.

• Housing turnover is generally not addressed in adequate public facilities policies.
IV. Relevant Data
How Many Kids Live There?!

A Student Generation Rate (SGR) is an average of the number of students per dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTYWIDE STUDENT GENERATION RATES</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dwelling Units</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL STUDENT GENERATION RATES</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, Clotstein, Kennedy, Northwood, Wheaton, Blak, Paint Branch and Springbrook clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upcounty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg, Damascus, Gaithersburg, Magruder, Northwest, Poolesville, Quince Orchard, Seneca Valley, Sherwood, and Watkins Mill clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates are calculated using Fall 2018 enrollment data from Montgomery County Public Schools. Of the nearly 165,000 students enrolled in MCPS schools in Fall 2018, Planning Staff were able to match 99.4% of the students to a housing type.
Census-Based SGRs
K-12 SGR by Census Tract

Census Tracts

- small, relatively permanent geographic entities
- boundaries follow visible features
- designed to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions
- optimum population size of 4,000 - generally ranges between 1,200 to 8,000+
Distribution of Census Tracts by: % of Households w/Children Under 18

- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

Count of Census Tracts
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% of Households w/Children Under 18
& Housing Type

- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>0.739</th>
<th>0.231</th>
<th>0.373</th>
<th>0.500</th>
<th>0.475</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by: Median Age

- 35 or less
- 35 - 40
- 40 - 45
- 45 - 50
- More than 50
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Median Age and Housing Type

-0.344
-0.041
-0.118
-0.382
-0.200
Distribution of Census Tracts by: Median Household Income

- $75K or less
- $75K - $125K
- $125K - $175K
- $175K - $225K
- More than $225K
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by: Median Household Income and Housing Type

- $75K or less
- $75K - $125K
- $125K - $175K
- $175K - $225K
- More than $225K

-0.008
-0.100
-0.063
-0.327
-0.219
Distribution of Census Tracts by:
% White Population (Non-Hispanic)

- 30% or less
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- 50% - 60%
- 60% - 70%
- More than 70%

Count of Census Tracts
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by: % White Population (Non-Hispanic) and Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>30% or less</th>
<th>30% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 50%</th>
<th>50% - 60%</th>
<th>60% - 70%</th>
<th>More than 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Types</td>
<td>-0.421</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by:
% People of Color (All Non-White)

- 20% or less
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- More than 80%

Map showing the distribution of census tracts with different color intensities indicating the percentage of people of color (All Non-White) in each tract.
Student Generation Rate of Census Tracts by: % People of Color and Housing Type

- 20% or less
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- More than 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>20% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 60%</th>
<th>60% - 80%</th>
<th>More than 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Types</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by: % Black Population (Non-Hispanic)

- 10% or less
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

Count of Census Tracts
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### Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:

**% Black Population (Non-Hispanic) and Housing Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>10% or less</th>
<th>10% - 20%</th>
<th>20% - 30%</th>
<th>30% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 50%</th>
<th>More than 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Types</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by:
% Hispanic Population

- 10% or less
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:

% Hispanic Population and Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>10% or less</th>
<th>10% - 20%</th>
<th>20% - 30%</th>
<th>30% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 50%</th>
<th>More than 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Types</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by: % Foreign-Born Population

- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

Count of Census Tracts

[Map showing distribution of census tracts by % foreign-born population]
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by: % Foreign-Born Population and Housing Type

- All Housing Types
- Single Family Houses
- Townhouses
- Low-Rise Multi-Family Units
- High-Rise Multi-Family Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>20% - 30%</th>
<th>30% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 50%</th>
<th>More than 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Census Tracts by: Population Density

- 1,000 or less
- 1,000 - 2,000
- 2,000 - 3,000
- 3,000 - 4,000
- 4,000 - 5,000
- 5,000 - 6,000
- 6,000 - 7,000
- 7,000 - 8,000
- 8,000 - 9,000
- 9,000 - 10,000
- More than 10,000

Count of Census Tracts
Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by: Population Density and Housing Type

-0.185 0.108 -0.161 0.115 0.039

All Housing Types Single Family Houses Townhouses Low-Rise Multi-Family Units High-Rise Multi-Family Units
1,000 or less 1,000 - 2,000 2,000 - 3,000 3,000 - 4,000 4,000 - 5,000 5,000 - 6,000
6,000 - 7,000 7,000 - 8,000 8,000 - 9,000 9,000 - 10,000 More than 10,000
Location-Based SGRs
Student Generation Rate by:
Transportation Policy Area Classification

Policy Area Categories
- Green
- Orange
- Red
- Yellow

Count of Units – All Housing Types
Student Generation Rate by:
Transportation Policy Area Classification
Student Generation Rate by:
Distance to Metro Station
Student Generation Rate by:
Distance to Metro Station

- **All SFD SFA MFL MFH**
  - **Within 1/4 mile**
  - **1/4 to 1/2 mile**
  - **Outside 1/2 mile**
Student Generation Rate by: Distance to Nearest School

- Inside 1/4 Mile of a School
- Between 1/4 and 1/2 Mile of a School
- Outside 1/2 Mile of a School

Count of Units – All Housing Types

- Inside 1/4 Mile of a School
- Between 1/4 and 1/2 Mile of a School
- Outside 1/2 Mile of a School
Student Generation Rate by:
Distance to Nearest School

- **Within 1/4 mile**
- **1/4 to 1/2 mile**
- **Outside 1/2 mile**
Student Generation Rate by: Inside/Outside the Beltway

- Inside Beltway
- Outside Beltway

Count of Units – All Housing Types
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Student Generation Rate by:
Inside/Outside the Beltway

- Inside Beltway
- Outside Beltway

[Bar chart showing Student Generation Rate for different categories inside and outside the Beltway]
Student Generation Rate by:
Inside/Outside Equity Emphasis Areas

**Equity Emphasis Areas** are defined by the Metropolitan Washington Area Council of Governments as Census tracts with higher than average concentration of low-income, minority populations, or both.
Student Generation Rate by:
Inside/Outside Equity Emphasis Areas

- Inside Equity Emphasis Area
- Outside Equity Emphasis Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inside Equity</th>
<th>Outside Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFH</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Funding Areas are designated smart growth areas identified by the county and certified by the state as eligible for state infrastructure funding.
Student Generation Rate by:
Inside/Outside Priority Funding Areas
Dwelling-Based SGRs
Average Rent per Square Foot
Multifamily dwelling units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rent per Square Foot</th>
<th>Count of Multifamily Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $1.49</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.50 - $1.75</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.75 - $2.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.00 - $2.25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25 - $2.50</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.50 - $2.75</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.75 - $3.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $3.00</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SGR by Average Rent per Square Foot
Multifamily dwelling units

NOTE: These are not the SGRs for units at these rent levels. They are the SGRs for units in buildings where the average rent falls in these ranges.
Average Unit Square Footage
Multifamily dwelling units

Count of Multifamily Units

Average Unit Square Footage in a Building

Under 500 500 - 599 sf 600 - 699 sf 700 - 799 sf 800 - 899 sf 900 - 999 sf Above 1000sf
SGR by Average Unit Square Footage
Multifamily dwelling units

NOTE: These are not the SGRs for units at these sizes. They are the SGRs for units in buildings where the average unit size falls in these ranges.
Units in Building by Share of 3-Bedroom Units
Multifamily dwelling units

Source: SDAT/DHCA
NOTE: These are not the SGRs for 3-bedroom units. They are the SGRs for all units in buildings where the share of 3-bedroom units falls into the indicated range.
Lot Size
Single family detached units

Average Lot Size by Census Tract
- 1/4-Acre and Under
- 1/4-Acre - 1/2-Acre
- 1/2-Acre - 3/4-Acre
- 3/4 Acre - 1-Acre
- Greater than 1-Acre

Count of Units – Single Family Detached Only

Lot Size (acres)
- Up to 1/4
- 1/4 to 1/2
- 1/2 to 3/4
- 3/4 to 1
- Over 1 acre
SGR by Lot Size
Single family detached units

Lot Size (acres)

- Up to 1/4
- 1/4 to 1/2
- 1/2 to 3/4
- 3/4 to 1
- Over 1
Gross Floor Area
Single family detached units

Average GFA by Census Tract
- 1000 - 1500
- 1501 - 2000
- 2001 - 2500
- 2501 - 3000
- 3001 - 3500
- 3501 - 4000
- 4001 - 4500
- 4501 - 5000

Count of Units – Single Family Detached Only
SGR by Gross Floor Area
Single family detached units
SGR by Year Built and Dwelling Type
Average Length of Time Since Units were Last Sold

Source: SDAT
SGR by Year Last Sold (SFD only)

Source: SDAT
Sources of Enrollment Growth
Housing Growth by Cluster, 2015-18

Number of Additional Dwelling Units

- Single Family Detached
- Single Family Attached
- Multifamily Low-rise
- Multifamily High-rise

Source: SDAT
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Share of Students and Units by Dwelling Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>K-12 Students</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFD Homes by Number of MCPS Students

- 73% of homes have 0 students
- 13% of homes have 1 student
- 10% of homes have 2 students
- 3% of homes have 3 students
- 1% of homes have 4 or more students

Homes with students on average have 1.7 MCPS students each.
Share of Students and Units by Dwelling Type

- **K-12 Students**
  - Single Family Houses: 55%
  - Townhouses: 22%
  - Low-Rise Multi-Family Units: 20%
  - High-Rise Multi-Family Units: 4%

- **Dwelling Units**
  - Single Family Houses: 13%
  - Townhouses: 18%
  - Low-Rise Multi-Family Units: 21%
  - High-Rise Multi-Family Units: 34%
Unit Mix for Highest Housing Growth Clusters (2011-15)

Gaithersburg
- Single Family Detached: 2%
- Single Family Attached: 12%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 32%
- Multifamily High-rise: 54%

Walter Johnson
- Single Family Detached: 12%
- Single Family Attached: 8%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 25%
- Multifamily High-rise: 55%

Clarksburg
- Single Family Detached: 19%
- Single Family Attached: 24%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 57%
- Multifamily High-rise: 5%

Bethesda-Chevy Chase
- Single Family Detached: 21%
- Single Family Attached: 2%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 1%
- Multifamily High-rise: 76%

Montgomery Blair
- Single Family Detached: 2%
- Single Family Attached: 11%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 87%
- Multifamily High-rise: 5%

Albert Einstein
- Single Family Detached: 5%
- Single Family Attached: 95%
- Multifamily Low-rise: 0%
- Multifamily High-rise: 0%
2018 Students Residing in Units Built 2011-15

2020 Subdivision Staging Policy Update – Schools Element
New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover

• From 2010 to 2015, countywide enrollment grew by 12,383 students.
• The 17,100+ new dwelling units built between 2011 and 2015 included 3,423 students in 2015, or **27.6%** of the enrollment growth.

• From 2015 to 2018, countywide enrollment grew by an additional 6,233 students.
• The 17,100+ new dwelling units built between 2011 and 2015 included 1,322 more students in 2018, or **21.2%** of the additional enrollment growth.
## New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>% of 2010 to 2015 Enrollment Growth Attributed to Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2015 SGR for Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2015 SGR for All Units</th>
<th>2015 SGR Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL UNITS</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>% of 2015 to 2018 Enrollment Growth Attributed to Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2018 SGR for Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2018 SGR for All Units</th>
<th>2018 SGR Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.679 (+28%)</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.428 (+43%)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.134 (+47%)</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.062 (+100%)</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL UNITS</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>0.277 (+39%)</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Viewpoints on Key Elements of the SSP
Annual School Test and Moratorium

- General agreement that the moratorium has not been effective at slowing enrollment growth.
- Moratorium + Development Pressure – serves as a tool to influence Board of Education capital investment
- Other consequences:
  - Hurts economic development and investment
  - Restricts housing supply, which therefore leads to an increase in home prices
  - Prevents the county from achieving its housing goals
  - Halts the construction of affordable housing units, which are primarily created through the MPDU program
  - Limits the collection of impact taxes, which help to fund the needed infrastructure
Adequacy Standards

• The idea of redefining the adequacy standards of the policy to include other facility conditions has been discussed
  • Some showed concerns over the potential complexity it may add
  • But general support for not only defining adequacy based on capacity

• Some options for execution that were discussed included:
  • Partnering with developers to handle facility maintenance projects,
  • Creating an equivalent of the transportation Unified Mobility Program for schools with facility needs
  • Using the MCPS Key Facilities Indicators metric as a measure of adequacy
Impact Taxes

- Discussed the appropriateness of setting impact taxes at 120% of the calculated impact.
- Questions around the justification for charging the supplemental impact tax for large homes ($2.00 per square foot beyond 3,500 square feet up to 8,500 square feet)
School Facility Payments

• Discussions around potentially re-introducing School Facility Payments in a tiered way

• The more over-crowded a school or cluster, the more the developer would pay in facility fees (would be in conjunction with elimination of the moratorium)
One-Size-Fits-All

• General recognition that there is no single growth context for the county

• How this potentially comes into play:
  • Application of the moratorium
  • Application of impact taxes, school facility payments, etc.
  • Application of various exceptions to the above
VI. Next Steps
Next Steps

• March 26 – Growth trends briefing for the Planning Board
• May – Briefings on the Working Draft
• June 11 – Public hearing
• June and July – Planning Board work sessions
• July 30 – Planning Board approves its draft and transmits it to the Council